

REMARKS

Claims 99, 107, 116, 125, 127-129, and 132 are currently amended. The drawings are amended. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments contained herein are fully supported by the specification as originally filed and do not contain new matter. Claims 106, 108, and 126 are canceled.

Drawings

The drawings were rejected under 37 CFR § 1.83(a), which indicates that the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Office action indicates that the plurality of ribs and grooves and the tearing lines having a substantially fret- or coil shaped path must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).

Applicant respectfully submits that 35 USC § 113 states that an "Applicant shall furnish a drawing where necessary for the understanding of the subject matter sought to be patented." Applicant contends that the plurality of ribs and grooves recited in claims 114, 115, and 116 are understandable to one of ordinary skill in the art from the context of claims 114, 115, and 116 and from paragraphs 0182-0187 and 0190 of the specification. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that drawings are not required to show the plurality of ribs and grooves and requests that the objection be removed.

Applicant submits that the tearing lines having a substantially fret- or coil shaped path are designated by reference number "208" in Figure 33, as amended, and are described in paragraphs 0218-0221 of the specification. Therefore, the tearing lines having a substantially fret- or coil shaped path are shown in the drawings, and thus the objection should be removed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 108, 116, and 128 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 116 and 128, as currently amended, overcome the rejections thereof under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and should be allowed. Claim 108 is canceled, mooted the rejection thereof.

Rejections Under U.S.C. § 102

Claim 125 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gold (DE 202 03 301). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 125, as currently amended, recites that the second adhesive tape has preferential tearing lines formed in said tape such as to configure for removal complementary portions of the tape each comprising one or more proximal ends of hair extensions. There is no indication of this in Gold. That is, there is no indication or suggestion in Gold of configuring for removal complementary portions of the tape, each complementary portion comprising one or more proximal ends of hair extensions. Therefore, Gold does not include each and every element of claim 125, so claim 125 is allowable.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 99-105, 109, and 117-124 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gold (DE 202 03 301). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 99, as currently amended, includes the subject matter of claim 106 and claim 108. The subject matter of claim 108, including the subject matter of claim 106, is indicated as being allowable if combined with claim 99. Claim 99, as currently amended, is the equivalent to rewriting claim 108 in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 99) and any intervening claims (claim 106). Claim 108 rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims is indicated as being allowable. Therefore, claim 99 is allowable.

Claims 100-105, 109, and 117-124 depend from claim 99 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 99.

Claims 106 and 110 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gold (DE 202 03 301) in view of Moffat Devine et al. (US. 6,703,097). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 99, as currently amended, is patentably distinct from Gold. Moreover, Gold in combination with Moffat Devine et al. fails to overcome the deficiencies of Gold with regard to claim 99, so claim 99 is allowable over Gold in view of Moffat Devine et al. Claims 106 and 110 depend from claim 99 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 99.

Claims 107 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gold (DE 202 03 301) in view of Lamb (DES 336,563). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 99, as currently amended, is patentably distinct from Gold. Moreover, Gold in combination with Lamb fails to overcome the deficiencies of Gold with regard to claim 99, so claim 99 is allowable over Gold in view of Lamb. Claim 107 depends from claim 99 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 99.

Claims 111-116 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gold (DE 202 03 301) in view of Kawashima (US. 6,534,172). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 99, as currently amended, is patentably distinct from Gold. Moreover, Gold in combination with Kawashima fails to overcome the deficiencies of Gold with regard to claim 99, so claim 99 is allowable over Gold in view of Kawashima. Claims 111-116 depend from claim 99 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 99.

Claims 126-132 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gold (DE 202 03 301) in view of Johnson et al. (US. 6,756,519). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 125, as currently amended, is patentably distinct from Gold. Moreover, Johnson et al. (Figure 1) shows perforations 18 that facilitate detachment of segments of a roll 10. However, there is no indication of the segments comprising one or more proximal ends of hair extensions. In addition, there is no indication or suggestion in Gold of configuring for removal complementary portions of the tape each comprising one or more proximal ends of hair extensions. Applicant thus contends that absent the teaching of the present application, there is no reason or motivation to configure for removal complementary portions of the tape each comprising one or more proximal ends of hair extensions. Therefore, Gold and Johnson et al. either alone or in combination do not include or suggest preferential tearing lines formed in said tape such as to configure for removal complementary portions of the tape each comprising one or

more proximal ends of hair extensions. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection fails to state a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), so claim 125 is allowable.

Claims 127-132 depend from claim 125 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 125. Claim 126 is canceled, mooted its rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 108 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 108 is canceled.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any further fees deemed necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501373.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2208.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10-28-2008



Tod A. Myrum
Reg. No. 42,922

Attorneys for Applicant
Leffert Jay & Polglaze, P. A.
P.O. Box 581009
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1009
T – (612) 312-2200
F – (612) 312-2250